REMARKS

In response to the above-identified Office Action, Applicants amend the Application and seek re-consideration in view of the following remarks. In this Response, Applicants amend claims 1-4, 7-9, 12, and 15-17. Applicants do not cancel or add any claims. Accordingly, claims 1-18 and 21-22 remain pending in the Application.

I.   Claim Objections

Claims 1-3, 7, 9, 12, and 16 stand objected to for various informalities. Specifically, the Patent Office points out that claims 2 and 3 erroneously recite "if the if the" and "if the the," respectively. Applicants have amended claim 2 to delete one recitation of: "if the;" and amended claim 3 to delete one recitation of: "the" to correct the syntax of these claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to claims 2 and 3.

Regarding claims 7, 9, 12, and 16, the Patent Office alleges that claims 7, 9, 12, and 16 each recite various grammatical errors. Applicants have amended claims 7, 9, 12, and 16 such that claims 7, 9, 12, and 16 recite grammatically correct elements. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to claims 7, 9, 12, and 16.

II.   Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 5, 11, and 15-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Patent Office alleges that the comparing "limitation as to matching 'a first header information section in the generated code' with 'a second header information section in the expected code' is not found as having a clear and proper description in the Specifications" (Paper No./Mail Date 20081121, page 3). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Paragraph [0012] of Applicants' specification reads:

9

> The method may also include comparing a header information section
> of the generated computer code to the expected header information
> section to determine if the header information section of the
> generated computer code matches the expected header information.

Furthermore, in response to the Patent Office's allegation that Applicants' disclosure of "shorthand" labels cannot be construed as a "header information section," Applicants' paragraph [0032] states: "In step 406, the shorthand notations are replaced by the full name [of the header section] in order to make the comparison of computer lines easier" (emphasis added). Therefore, Applicants submit that the subject matter of claims 5, 11, and 18 are properly described in Applicants' disclosure because the shorthand notations are replaced by the full name prior to comparison. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5, 11, and 18.

Regarding the rejection of claims 15-17, the Patent Office alleges that the "comparing" step fails to recite what the "expected code" is being compared to determine the expected form in claim 15, the correct number of lines in claim 16, and the proper logical order in claim 17. Applicants have amended each of claims 15-17 to recite that the expected code is being compared to the generated code, which is clearly disclosed in Applicants' specification. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 15-17.

III.   Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-18 and 21-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,983,446 issued to Charisius et al. ("*Charisius*") in view of the ordinary skill in the art ("*OSA*"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, at least in view of the amendments to independent claims 1 and 12.

To render a claim obvious, the cited reference must teach or suggest each and every element of the rejected claim (*see* MPEP § 2143). Among other elements, claim 1 defines:

> A method for verifying computer code having a plurality of lines
> generated by a code generating module from a model file of a system
> including a plurality of functions generated by a model module, the
> method comprising:

10

> generating expected code for the generated computer code
> based on the determined values, inputs, outputs, function type, and
> syntax for the generated computer code; [and]
>
> comparing each line of the generated computer code and the
> expected code to determine if the generated computer code includes
> correct values, correct inputs, correct outputs, correct functions, and
> correct syntax. (Emphasis added).

Applicants submit that the combination of *Charisius* and the *OSA* fails to teach or suggest at least these elements of amended claim 1.

> *Charisius* discloses a software development tool that provides:
>
> simultaneous round-trip engineering, i.e., the graphical representation
> 204 is synchronized with the textual representation 206. Thus, if a
> change is made to the source code 202 via the graphical
> representation 204, the textual representation 206 is updated
> automatically. Similarly, if a change is made to the source code 202
> via the textual representation 206, the graphical representation 204 is
> updated to remain synchronized. There is no repository, no batch
> code generation, and no risk of losing code. (Col. 5, lines 50-60).

Therefore, Applicants submit that *Charisius* discloses a system and method for automatically updating a graphical representation of source code when changes are being made to the source code itself and updating the source code when changes are being made to the graphical representation of the source code. In other words, *Charisius* discloses a system where the source code is automatically updated as the model is changed and the model is updated as the source code is changed. Thus, Applicants submit that an "expected computer code" is not being generated in *Charisius*' system and method as recited in claim 1. Specifically, *Charisius* does not disclose two codes being generated from the same model file, and certainly does not disclose a second computer code being generated and used to verify the correctness (e.g., values, inputs, outputs, function type, and syntax) of the first computer code because *Charisius* is concerned with modifying the model file

11

and the source code simultaneously so that they are consistent with one another. That is, the source code is not used to check the correctness of the model file and vice versa in *Charisius*' system and method. Therefore, *Charisius* fails to teach or suggest each and every element of amended claim 1. The Patent Office relies on the *OSA* to cure the defects of *Charisius*; however, Applicants submit that the *OSA* fails to cure such defects.

In making the rejection, the Patent Office does not rely on the *OSA* as teaching or suggesting the elements of "generating expected code for the generated computer code based on the determined values, inputs, outputs, function type, and syntax for the generated computer code" and "comparing each line of the generated computer code and the expected code to determine if the generated computer code includes correct values, correct inputs, correct outputs, correct functions, and correct syntax," as recited in amended claim 1. Furthermore, Applicants submit that it is not within the skill set of the skilled artisan is this art to know such elements. Therefore, the *OSA* fails to cure the defects of *Charisius*.

The failure of the combination of *Charisius* and the *OSA* to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1 is fatal to the obviousness rejection. Therefore, claim 1 is not obvious over *Charisius* in view of the *OSA*. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 1.

Claims 2-6 and 21 depend from claim 1 and include all of the elements thereof. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 2-6 and 21 are not obvious over *Charisius* in view of the *OSA* at least for the same reasons as claim 1, in addition to their own respective features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-6 and 21.

Regarding the rejection of claims 7-11 and 22, claims 7-11 and 22 each recite the elements of "code that <u>generates</u> an expected computer code based on the determined values, inputs, outputs, function type, and syntax" (emphasis added) and "code that compares each line in the generated computer code and the expected code to determine if the generated computer code includes the determined values, inputs, outputs, function type, and syntax in the expected computer code" similar to the elements of "generating expected code for the generated computer code based on the

determined values, inputs, outputs, function type, and syntax for the generated computer code" and "comparing each line of the generated computer code and the expected code to determine if the generated computer code includes correct values, correct inputs, correct outputs, correct functions, and correct syntax," as recited in claim 1. As such, Applicants submit that the discussion above regarding the combination of *Charisius* and the *OSA* failing to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1 is equally applicable to similar elements recited in claims 7-11. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 7-11 and 22 are not obvious over *Charisius* in view of the *OSA* at least for the same reasons as claim 1, in addition to their own respective features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7-11 and 22.

Regarding the rejection of claims 12-18, claims 12-18 each recite the elements of "<u>generate</u> expected computer code for the generated computer code based on the determined values, inputs, outputs, functions type, and syntax for the generated computer code" (emphasis added) and "compare each line in the generated computer code with the expected computer code to determine if the generated computer code includes correct values, correct inputs, correct outputs, correct functions, and correct syntax" similar to the elements of "generating expected code for the generated computer code based on the determined values, inputs, outputs, function type, and syntax for the generated computer code" and "comparing each line of the generated computer code and the expected code to determine if the generated computer code includes correct values, correct inputs, correct outputs, correct functions, and correct syntax," as recited in claim 1. As such, Applicants submit that the discussion above regarding the combination of *Charisius* and the *OSA* failing to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1 is equally applicable to similar elements recited in claims 12-18. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 12-18 are not obvious over *Charisius* in view of the *OSA* at least for the same reasons as claim 1, in addition to their own respective features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 12-18.

13

IV.   **Claim Amendments**

Claims 4 and 8 have been amended to correct various informalities similar to claims 3 and 7, respectively. That is, claim 4 have been amended to delete one recitation of "the" in an incorrect "the the" recitation. Furthermore, claim 8 has been amended such that the recitation of "a first line" is grammatically correct.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending are in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would be useful in moving the application forward to allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (480) 385-5060 or jgraff@ifllaw.com.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

INGRASSIA, FISHER & LORENZ

Date: January 22, 2009   By: /JASON R. GRAFF, REG. NO. 54,134/
                                                  Jason R. Graff
                                                  Reg. No. 54,134
                                                  (480) 385-5060